

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. All pending claims are rejected. In the above amendments, claims 1-2, 9, and 14-17 have been amended. In view of these claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

**I. Claim 9 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 9 has been amended to address the issue that was raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

**II. Claims 1-17 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,522,880 to Verma et al. (hereinafter, “Verma”). In view of the above claim amendments, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP § 2131 (citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” Id. (citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). In addition, “the reference must be enabling and describe the applicant’s claimed invention sufficiently to have placed it in possession of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention.” In re Paulsen, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 1 recites “assigning a micro-tunnel to the data service session for the mobile node.” In the above amendments, claim 1 was amended to recite “wherein the micro-tunnel is a logical connection between a packet data service node and a packet control function/base station controller.” This amendment is supported by at least paragraph [0021] of Applicants’ specification.

Verma does not disclose a “micro-tunnel” as defined in amended claim 1. The Office Action asserts that “assigning a micro-tunnel to the data service session for the mobile node” is disclosed in col. 3, lines 30-49 of Verma. (Office Action, page 3.) Applicants respectfully disagree.

The cited portion of Verma states:

When a mobile node connects to a gateway on the Internet, a Point-to-Point Protocol (PPP) session is typically established between the mobile node and the gateway device. ... The gateway, or tunnel initiator, typically initiates establishment of a tunnel connection to a tunnel endpoint server. For example, when a mobile node is connected to a foreign agent, a connection oriented point-to-point communication link, such as a Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol (L2TP) tunnel, is typically established between the foreign agent and the home agent to permit the transfer of data to and from the mobile node.

(Verma, col. 3, lines 30-45.) Thus, Verma describes a “Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol (L2TP) tunnel” being “established between the foreign agent and the home agent.”

However, the “Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol (L2TP) tunnel” referred to in Verma is not a “micro-tunnel,” as recited in claim 1. As indicated above, claim 1 has been amended to recite that “the micro-tunnel is a logical connection between a packet data service node and a packet control function/base station controller.” The “Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol (L2TP) tunnel” referred to in Verma does not satisfy this feature of the “micro-tunnel” that is recited in claim 1. Verma does not have anything to do with communications between a “packet data service node” and a “packet control function/base station controller.” In fact, Applicants cannot find either of these terms anywhere in Verma.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinct from Verma. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 14-17 have been amended to recite the features noted above for claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2 and 14-17 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as presented above in relation to claim 1.

Claims 3-13 are dependent on claim 2. As indicated above, claim 2 has been amended to recite the features noted above for claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the

rejection of claims 3-13 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as presented above in relation to claim 1.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Verma does not disclose “wherein the first and second micro-tunnel identifiers identify a first and second micro-tunnel within the tunnel,” as recited in dependent claim 7. The Office Action asserts that this feature of claim 7 is disclosed in Verma because “[t]unnels 56 and 66 are assigned with [t]unnel IDs, respectively, for identifying the respective tunnel.” (Office Action, page 5.) Applicants respectfully disagree.

Figure 1 of Verma “shows an architecture 10 that illustrates an example of the connection of a mobile node 20 to public IP network 70.” (Verma, col. 2, lines 6-8.) Verma states:

Public IP network 70 includes two foreign agents 30 and 40 that act as tunnel initiators responsive to the establishment of a link with mobile node 20. The network also includes a tunnel endpoint server 50 that is the home agent for mobile node 20 in this example.

\*\*\*

Using the mobile node's home agent information, tunnel initiator 30 establishes L2TP tunnel 56 to tunnel endpoint server 50, which is the home agent for mobile node 20.

\*\*\*

In protocols that support client mobility, mobile node 20 typically senses that it has lost contact with tunnel initiator 30 when it times out waiting for an advertisement message from tunnel initiator 30. Mobile node 20 will then look for an advertisement message from a new foreign agent, such as tunnel initiator 40. When mobile node 20 receives an advertisement message from a foreign agent, tunnel initiator 40 in this case, it sends a registration message that initiates set-up of link 24 and set-up of tunnel connection 66.

(Verma, col. 2, lines 8-51.) Thus, Verma describes the establishment of two tunnel connections 56, 66.

However, Verma does not disclose “a first and second micro-tunnel within [a] tunnel,” as recited in claim 7. The two tunnel connections 56, 66 described in Verma are not the same as “a first and second micro-tunnel within [a] tunnel.” Verma does not describe a “micro-tunnel” within either of the tunnel connections 56, 66. In addition, the two tunnel connections 56, 66 in Verma cannot reasonably be construed as the “first and second micro-tunnel” recited in claim 7, because claim 7 requires that the “first and second micro-tunnel” are “within [a] tunnel.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this is an additional reason why the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

**III. Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 5, 2007

By: /Kristine U. Ekwueme/  
Kristine Ekwueme, Reg. No. 56,344  
(858) 658-1901

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 651-4125  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502